

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office action mailed July 8, 2009 ("the Office Action"). The foregoing amendment cancels claims 3, 9-11, 16-18, 21, 27-29, 34-36, 39, 45-48, 52, 53, and 55-59; amends claims 1, 2, 4-8, 12-15, 19, 20, 22-26, 30-33, 37, 38, 40-44, 49, 50, 51, and 54; and adds new claims 60-72. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 12-15, 19, 20, 22-26, 30-33, 37, 38, 40-44, 49, 50, 51, 54, and 60-72 are now pending in view of the amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicants present remarks in the order that the Office Action raises the corresponding issues.

In connection with the prosecution of this case and any related cases, Applicants have, and/or may, discuss various aspects of the disclosure of the cited references as those references are then understood by the Applicants. Because such discussion could reflect an incomplete or incorrect understanding of one or more of the references, the position of the Applicants with respect to a reference is not necessarily fixed or irrevocable. Applicants thus hereby reserve the right, both during and after prosecution of this case, to modify the views expressed with regard to any reference.

Please note that Applicants do not intend the following remarks to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claims. Rather, Applicants present the distinctions below solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claims and the cited references. Finally, Applicants request that Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants' understanding and discussion of any reference is consistent with Examiner's understanding.

Unless otherwise explicitly stated, the term "Applicants" is used herein generically and may refer to a single inventor, a set of inventors, an appropriate assignee, or any other entity or person with authority to prosecute this application.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

Claims 15-17, 33-35 and 51-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the

invention. Claims 15, 33, and 51 have been amended to remove the word "or." The other claims are all cancelled, thereby obviating this objection. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-59 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)¹ over *Bradd et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0118002). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in light of the claim amendments and the following remarks.

According to MPEP §2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(a), (b), or (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference. The reference must show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Finally, the elements must be arranged or combined as required by the claim.

Independent claim 1 has been amended so as to recite a method of sharing resources between devices "a first association of devices" and "a second association of devices." Each association of devices is now defined as having a gateway device with an external identifier (see, for example, original claims 10, 11, 17, and 18). Further, each gateway device is now defined as storing a record of resources from devices within its association (as discussed in the specification on page 24, lines 10-15, page 25, lines 13-16, and page 27, lines 4-8) as well as externally available resources (as discussed in the specification on, for example, page 25, last two lines; and page 26, lines 11-14). In addition, when a device within one of the associations requests use of a particular resource, its gateway device uses the stored records to determine where to send the request (as discussed in the specification on, for example, page 23, lines 8-10).

Thus, claim 1, as amended, relates to sharing of a plurality of resources between a plurality of devices, each of which is in either a first association of devices or a second

¹ Because *Bradd* is only citable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) or 35 U.S.C. §102(a), Applicants do not admit that *Bradd* is in fact prior art with respect to any or all of the claims of the present application, but rather reserve the right to swear behind *Bradd* in this application or a divisional, continuation, or CIP thereof, thereby removing *Bradd* as a reference.

association of devices. The first association of devices has a first gateway device with a first external identifier and the second association of devices has a second gateway device with a second external identifier.

The first gateway device stores a record of:

a plurality of resources provided by the devices within the first association of devices that are available for use by devices external to the first association, and where each resource is associated in the first record with a corresponding internal identifier; and

a plurality of resources provided by devices within the second association of devices that are available for use by devices external to the second association.

Further, the second gateway device stores a record of:

a plurality of resources provided by devices within the second association of devices that are available for use by devices external to the second association, and where each resource is associated in the second record with a corresponding internal identifier; and

a plurality of resources provided by devices within the first association of devices that are available for use by devices external to the first association.

As defined in the claims, when a first device within the first association of devices wishes to be provided with a particular resource available from a second device in the second association of devices, a first communication is sent from the first device within the first association of devices to the first gateway device. The first gateway device uses its first record to determine an external identifier associated with that particular resource. The first gateway device sends a second communication relating to the provision of that particular resource, the second communication including the determined external identifier for enabling the second communication to be received by the second association of devices. This allows the request for the resource to be delivered to the destination device in the second association of devices.

In contrast, *Bradd* addresses the scarcity problem of public IP addresses, and particularly specific problems associated with VoIP transmissions. *Bradd* is only concerned with allowing a VoIP communication to be delivered between two domains. At best, *Bradd* can be considered to

relate to the sharing of a single resource (VoIP communication) between two domains. In *Bradd* there is no plurality of resources, and there is accordingly no gateway device of each domain that stores a record of a plurality of resources provided by devices within its domain and a record of a plurality of resources provided in an external domain. *Bradd* does not disclose a method of sharing a plurality of resources, nor does it define gateway devices which register a plurality of available resources from external associations of devices, and which accordingly incorporate the external identifier of the external association of devices into outgoing communications in order to enable the request for resources to be delivered. It is therefore submitted that claim 1, as amended, is novel over this citation.

Although obviousness was not an objection specifically raised in the Office Action, the following discussion is included for the sake of completeness.

Bradd does not consider the issue of sharing a plurality of resources between a plurality of different associations of devices, particularly from a remote perspective. *Bradd* addresses wholly different problems to that of the present invention: *Bradd* is concerned with overcoming difficulties due to a shortage of IP addresses through the provision of network address translation. *Bradd* does not relate to the field of resource sharing.

Independent claim 19 is directed to a system, and has been amended in a similar manner to independent method claim 1. Likewise, independent claim 37, directed to an "association" of devices, has been amended in a similar manner to independent method claim 1. It is submitted that these independent claims are novel and non-obvious over the disclosure of *Bradd* for the reasons stated above in relation to independent claim 1. Further, it is submitted that the claims dependent from independent claims 1, 19, and 37, whether directly or indirectly, are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable independent claim.

New Claims 60-72

By this amendment, new claims 60-72 are added. Support for claim 60 may be found at least at page 21, lines 5-8, and the paragraph bridging pages 26 and 27. Support for claim 61 may be found at least at page 21, lines 8 to 10. Support for claim 62 may be found at least at page 26, lines 1-2. Support for claim 63 may be found at least page 25, lines 3-6 and page 7,

lines 4 to 13. Support for claim 64 may be found at least at page 24, lines 20-22. New claims 65 to 69 are system claims corresponding to new method claims 60 to 64, respectively. New claims 70 to 72 are "association" claims corresponding to new method claims 62 to 64, respectively.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 60-72 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from one of allowable independent claims 1, 19, and 37.

Charge Authorization

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any of the following fees that may be applicable to this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-3178: (1) any filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16; (2) any patent application and reexamination processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17; and/or (3) any post issuance fees under 37 CFR § 1.20. In addition, if any additional extension of time is required, which has not otherwise been requested, please consider this a petition therefor and charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable. In the event that Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview or overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 8th day of October, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ronald J. Ward/Reg. No. 54,870

RONALD J. WARD
Registration No. 54,870
ERIC L. MASCHOFF
Registration No. 36,596
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

RJW:jbh
2562248_1.DOC